Homorable James O. Raetland Chairman Consistee on the Judiciary United States Senate Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Senator Sastiand:

You have requested our views on S. 1489, "A pill to peemi fittle 28 of the United States Code to provide for certain judicial review of administrative reservals and suspensions of Federal omployees."

Disenter Reating introduced S. 1889, it was stated that the primary purpose of the bill was to give to all U.S. District Courts the jurisdiction which had previously been reserved to the District Court for the District of Columbia in cases involving dismissals of employees. This would avoid instances where hardship resulted from requiring all Government employees to file such suits in the District of Columbia. It was also stated that the bill would give the U.S. District Courts jurisdiction to commider both the reinstatement and claims for back pay in the same action.

the sarite by U.S. District Courts in every case without regard to the basis for the determination to suspend or separate. This would expand the current practice based on existing law of reviewing only those cases where there is a constitutional question or showing of arbitary and capricious action. The possible questions thus presented are proper subjects for comment by other departments and appropries such as the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Austice. In addition, I am concerned that if sweeted in

Approved For Release 2004/05/13: CIA-RDP91-00965R000400290015-0

its present form, S. 1489 could be construed so as to qualify the authority granted the Director of Central Intelligence by the Congress in Section 102 (c) of the Mational Security Act of 1947, as amended.

If you desire further information, I shall be pleased to discuss it with you personally or numbers of your committee staff may contact my Legislative Counsel, Mr. John S. Warner.

The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

Allon W. Dilles
Director

060: 360